REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 9, 16, and 24.

New Claims

Dependent claims 28 and 29 have been newly added by this response. Claim 28 recites that the request is forwarded from one policy decision point to another policy decision point for evaluation. That is, a referral policy may exist in the first policy engine that indicates that the policy evaluation for a particular request may be performed by a second policy engine. Support for this newly added claim may be found on pages 15-16 of the Specification. Further, dependent claim 29 recites that the policy decision of a particular resource is stored in a cache, so that evaluation of a subsequent request for the same resource can be performed more quickly using the stored policy decision. Support for this newly added claim can be found on page 16, lines 16-20 of the Specification.

Claim Amendments

The independent claims have been amended to clarify that the resource names are organized in a hierarchical organization. The hierarchical organization organizes resource names by creating a top-level resource name (*i.e.,* a parent resource name) and placing sub-resource names as children resource names associated with the parent resource name, where the children resource names include the top-level resource name and an additional name portion

separated from the top-level resource name by a delimiter. Accordingly, the independent claims now recite "wherein said hierarchical structure comprises a top-level resource name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding to said top level resource name, wherein said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level resource name and an additional name portion separated from the top-level resource name by a delimiter." The claim amendments further clarify that the relationship among resources is based on the name of each resource. Further, dependent claims 2, 4, 10, 11, 17, and 19 have been amended to correct formalities (*e.g.*, antecedent basis, etc.) because of the amendments to the independent claims.

No new matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in Figure 4 and the accompanying text in the Specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0186238 ("Sylor") in view of European Patent Application EP1009130A1 ("Brun"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to determining whether a particular resource is associated with an access control policy using a hierarchical organization that organizes resources based on the resource names. Specifically, when access to a particular resource is requested, the resource name is looked up in the hierarchical organization and it is determined whether the resource name is associated with an access control policy. Once the resource name is located, the access control policy associated with the resource can be retrieved and the request can be evaluated against the access control policy to determine whether to grant access to the resource.

The hierarchical organization includes a top-level resource name (*i.e.,* a root resource name) and one or more sub-resource names (*i.e.,* children resource names), where each sub-resource name is placed in the hierarchical organization based on common portions of the sub-resource name with the top-level resource name. For example, a resource name www.abc.com may be a top-level resource name, placed in the hierarchical organization as the root. In this case, sub-resource name www.abc.com/news would be a child resource name that includes the top-level resource name and an additional name portion (*i.e.,* news) separated from the top-level resource name by a delimiter (*e.g.,*"/") (*see* Specification, Figure 4 and accompanying text).

Turning to the rejection of the claims, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness "[f]irst, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (*See* MPEP §2143.03). Further, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." (*See* MPEP §2143.03). The Applicant respectfully asserts that the references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of amended independent claim 1.

Specifically, Sylor fails to disclose or suggest a hierarchical organization that organizes resources based on the resource names, as recited in the claims of the present invention. Rather, Sylor discloses that resources are organized in a visual hierarchy based on *dependency relationships* (*see* Sylor, paragraph [0049]). That is, if resource A is dependent on resource B, then resource A may be somehow associated with resource B in the visual hierarchy. Sylor discloses that dependency relationships represent a condition by which events in one resource

9

can influence the status of another resource (*see* Sylor, paragraph [0079], Figure 5). Sylor is completely silent with respect to arranging resources in a hierarchical form based on the name of the resource. Instead, Sylor only discloses organizing resources based on dependency relationships, which have nothing to do with the names of the resources.

Further, Brun fails to supply that which Sylor lacks. Brun relates to locating network resources in a packet switching network. Specifically, Brun discloses locating network resources in an access subnetwork which comprise access border nodes directly connected to a backbone subnetwork. The backbone subnetwork comprises backbone border nodes directly connected to the access subnetworks. Each network resource name includes a prefix that is compared with prefixes stored in an access border node directory database to determine whether the resource name relates to a resource local to the access border node subnetwork (*see* Brun, Abstract). However, Brun fails to disclose or suggest organizing resources hierarchically based on the resource names, as recited in the claims of the present invention. In fact, Brun is completely silent with respect to organizing the resources in any manner, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Brun solely for the purpose of disclosing comparing resources names to determine a relationship between resource names (*see* Office Action mailed December 15, 2005, page 3).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claim 1 is patentable over Sylor and Brun, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, independent claims 9 and 16 have been amended to include similar allowable subject matter and are patentable over Sylor and Brun for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Dependent claims 3, 8, 15, 18, and 23 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 10, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor, in view of Brun, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0213258 ("Ramamoorthy"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Sylor and Brun fail to render the amended independent claims obvious. Further, Ramamoorthy fails to supply that which Sylor and Brun lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Ramamoorthy solely for the purpose of disclosing that resources are associated with access policies and that requestors are inherently checked for access privileges (*see* Office Action mailed December 15, 2005, page 5). Thus, it is clear that Sylor, Brun, and Ramamoorthy, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render independent claims 1, 9, and 16 obvious. Dependent claims 2, 10, and 17 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 11, 19, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor in view of Brun, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,974 ("Loucks"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Sylor and Brun fail to render amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16 obvious. Further, Loucks fails to supply that which Sylor and Brun lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Loucks solely for the purpose of disclosing that resource components are separated by a delimiter (*see* Office Action mailed December 15, 2005, page 6). Thus, it is clear that Sylor, Brun, and Loucks, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render independent claims 1, 9, and 16 obvious. Further, independent claim 24 has been amended to include similar allowable subject matter as independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and is

patentable over Sylor, Brun, and Loucks for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 4, 11, and 19 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor in view of Brun, further in view of Loucks, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0128615 ("Carmel"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that various combinations of one or more of *four* references have been used in rejecting the claims of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The purported reconstruction of the claimed invention by reliance on such a large number of references including, for example, a method for *indexing a semi-structured document*, which has nothing to do with access policies governing access to resources, is not appropriate. There is no suggestion or motivation that would enable one skilled in the art to turn to this combination of references to achieve the claimed invention. It is abundantly clear that the Examiner, using the present application as a guide, has selected isolated features of the various relied-upon references to arrive at the limitations of the claimed invention. Use of the present application as a "road map" for selecting and combining prior art disclosures is wholly improper. *See* MPEP § 2143; *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (stating that "[t]he invention must be viewed not with the blueprint drawn by the inventor, but in the state of the art that existed at the time"); *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (stating that "it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious . . . . This court has previously stated that 'one cannot use hindsight

reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.'"); *In re Wesslau*, 353 F.2d 238 (C.C.P.A. 1965) (stating that "it is impermissible within the framework of section 103 to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art") (*see also, Ex parte Lee Evan Nakamura*, et al, Appeal No. 2004-2245 (2005), which states that using four or more references to reject narrow claims with 2-3 limitations is suspect).

Assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner has met his burden to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, as described above, Sylor, Brun, and Loucks fail to render amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 obvious. Further, Carmel fails to supply that which Sylor, Brun, and Loucks lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Carmel solely for the purpose of disclosing indexing and querying documents, where context delimiters are used for both indexing and querying into documents, and for disclosing receiving information for wildcard pattern matching of resource names (*see* Office Action mailed December 15, 2005, page 7). Thus, it is clear that Sylor, Brun, Loucks, and Carmel, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 obvious. Dependent claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, and 26 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 14, 22, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor, Brun, Loucks, and further in view of Carmel and U.S. Patent No. 6,026,440 ("Shrader"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

13

As described above, Sylor, Brun, Loucks, and Carmel fail to render amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 obvious. Further, Shrader fails to supply that which Sylor, Brun, Loucks, and Carmel lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Shrader solely for the purpose of disclosing receiving information indicating whether a resource name is case-sensitive (*see* Office Action mailed December 15, 2005, page 7).

Thus, it is clear that Sylor, Brun, Loucks, Carmel, and Shrader, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 obvious. Dependent claims 7, 14, 22, and 27 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/497001).

Dated: February 22, 2006   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

133171_1.DOC

14